

REMARKS

Status

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated March 1, 2006, in which Claims 1-53 were rejected. No claims have been canceled; Claims 1, 6, 11, 21, 22, 32, 33, and 43 have been amended; and no new claims have been added. Accordingly, Claims 1-53 are pending in the application, and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC 103

Claims 1-53 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over US Application No. 2002/0087622 (*Anderson*) in view of US Patent No. 6,646,754 (*Redd*). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention is not obvious from the cited references since features of the present invention are not disclosed or taught by the cited references.

For example, neither *Anderson* nor *Redd* teach or disclose the feature claimed in amended Claim 1 of using a software program at a first location to select and arrange a plurality of digital images in a user-identified order to produce a multimedia composition comprised of the plurality of digital images and having textual and audio content. There is no discussion in *Anderson* of a user selecting and arranging images – in a particular order – to compose a multimedia composition. Rather, *Anderson* is looking at individual images, as described in Paragraphs [0017] and [0051]. Since neither of the cited references teach or disclose this claimed feature of the present invention, Claim 1 is not obvious, and therefore believed to be patentable.

With regard to Claims 2-10, these claims are dependent on Claim 1 and therefore include all the features thereof. For the reasons set forth above with regard to Claim 1, Claims 2-10 are also believed to be patentable. In addition, with specific regard to Claims 6 and 7, *Redd* discloses back-printing information (see *Redd* Col 7, line 4). Accordingly, *Redd* does not teach the inclusion of audio material and textual information as part of a multimedia composition, as claimed in Claims 6 and 7.

With regard to independent Claims 11, 21, 22, 32, 33, and 43, the same arguments set forth above with regard to Claim 1 are equally applicable with respect to the rejection of these claims. As such, independent Claims 11, 21, 22, 32, 33, and 43 are believed to be patentable.

Claims 12-20 are dependent on Claim 11, and therefore include all the features thereof. For the reasons set forth above with regard to Claim 11, dependent claims Claim 12-20 are also believed to be patentable.

Claims 23-31 are dependent on Claim 22 and therefore include all the features thereof. For the reasons set forth above with regard to Claim 22, Claims 23-31 are also believed to be patentable.

Claims 34-42 are dependent on Claim 33 and therefore include all the features thereof. For the reasons set forth above with regard to Claim 33, Claims 34-42 are also believed to be patentable.

Claims 44-52 are dependent on Claim 43 and therefore include all the features thereof. For the reasons set forth above with regard to Claim 43, Claims 44-52 are also believed to be patentable.

The same arguments set forth above with regard to Claim 1 are equally applicable with respect to the rejection of Claim 53. Accordingly, Claim 53 is believed to be patentable.


Summary

Should the Examiner consider that additional amendments are necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the favor is requested of a telephone call to the undersigned counsel for the purpose of discussing such amendments.

For the reasons set forth above, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees in connection with this communication to Eastman Kodak Company Deposit Account No. 05-0225.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,324

Susan L. Parulski/law
Rochester, NY 14650-2201
Telephone: (585) 477-4027
Facsimile: (585) 477-4646